

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed May 4, 2006.

Currently, claims 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 60-73, 80, and 82-86 are pending. Claims 82-86 are new. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of all pending claims.

I. Election of Species

Applicant asserts that all pending claims read on the elected species, and many of the pending claims are generic to multiple species.

II. Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 63 due to a typographical error. That error has been fixed.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 52-59, 62-72, 80 and 81 as being anticipated by Matsuzaki. Because Matsuzaki does not disclose all of the limitations of Applicant's claims, Applicant asserts that the pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art.

For example, Matsuzaki does not disclose that "one of said side surfaces includes a notch portion and an angle portion," as recited in claim 52. The second paragraph of page 7 of Applicant's specification provides an example of dimensions for the subject memory card that illustrate the goal of obtaining a very small sized memory card. To obtain the desired size, Applicant has made use of the recited "raised portion" to fit all of the necessary components and/or be able to grab the memory card. Applicant has made use of the angle portion and/or notch portion to position and secure the small memory card in the correct position. This combination of features - raised portion, notch and angle - all contribute to the successful design of a small sized memory card. The fact that this card disclosed in Matsuzaki includes an imaging device suggests a larger card that may not need the combination recited in claim 1 of the raised portion, notch portion and angle portion. Thus, Matsuzaki's failure to disclose "one of said side surfaces includes a notch portion and an angle portion," as recited in claim 52 is significant. For

these reasons, Applicant asserts that claim 52, and all of the claims that depend from claim 52, are patentable over the cited prior art.

Claims 63, and all claims that depend from claim 63, are patentable over the cited prior art for the same reasons as claim 52.

Claims 80 and 83-86 are patentable over the cited prior art for similar reasons as claim 52. For example, the cited prior art does not disclose the different thicknesses and “said side surface includes a notch portion” as recited in claim 80. The cited prior art also does not disclose “said top surface having a raised portion, one of said side surfaces includes an angle portion” as recited in claim 83.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 60, 61 and 73 as being obvious in light of Matsuzaki and Ringer. Because the cited prior art, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Applicant’s claims, Applicant asserts that the pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art.

First, claims 60, 61 and 73 are patentable over the prior art for the same reasons described above with regard to the respective independent claims.

Additionally, claim 61 recites that the molding material defines the top surface (which has a raised portion) and the side surface (which has the angle portion and notch portion). These limitations are not taught or suggested in the cited prior art references. A similar argument applies to claims 73 and 84-86.

V. New Claim 82

Applicant has added new claim 82. The prior art does not disclose “molding material forming a peripheral card having a top surface, a front surface, a rear surface and two side surfaces, one of said side surfaces has an angle portion and a notch portion, said top surface having a raised portion adjacent said rear surface, said peripheral card having a first section and a second section, said second section is thicker than said first section to accommodate said passive

electrical component, said circuit board and said flash memory are positioned in said molding material.”

VI. Conclusion

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner’s prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including November 4, 2006.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this document, including any fee for extension of time, which may be requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 30, 2006

By: /Burt Magen/
Burt Magen
Reg. No. 37,175

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, California 94105
Telephone: 415.369.9660
Facsimile: 415.369.9665